arXiv:1405.7599v1 [physics.gen-ph] 10 May 2014

On the material origin of the cosmological constant

Herman Telkamp*

Abstract

We consider a possible connection between matter and cosmological constant Λ via the Newtonian cosmic potential of the matter within the expanding particle horizon. Consistent with GR, an increasing potential may drive the metric expansion of space. Cosmic recession of mass must, in turn, affect the potential in an opposite sense. Independent of this, several considerations point at $-\frac{1}{2}c^2$ as the representation of the background potential in the various GR metrics. This suggests that the cosmic potential, while subject to the expansion of space, always yields a constant background potential $-\frac{1}{2}c^2$. Analysis of this "redshift" of the cosmic potential yields for perfect fluids the exact same solutions of the scale factor as the standard Friedmann equations, including an accelerating de Sitter universe. Densities of dust and Λ relate as $\Omega_{\Lambda o} = \frac{3}{2}\Omega_{mo}$. Though counter intuitive at first sight, gravity may drive cosmic acceleration.

The very nature of the cosmological constant Λ has been subject of discussion from its conception onward. Einstein, while convinced of the Machian principle, held for a long time that the constant must have a material origin. De Sitter, on the other hand, showed that his solution of the Einstein equations for an empty universe allows for a non-zero cosmological constant. That is, for an accelerating empty universe with $\Lambda > 0$, hence attributing the origin of the constant to space itself. In empty space there is not much one can relate the energy density of Λ to, other than the zero-point energy of the quantum vacuum. But any attempts to connect this huge vacuum energy density to the extremely small dark energy density failed so far.

Apart from this particular question about the origin of Λ, there is no satisfactory answer to why the universe expands anyway. Recession is viewed either as inertial motion or as metric expansion. Both views are viable and exchangeable, at least to a considerable extent, but only if the universe is flat and decelerating. The Newtonian view on recession is that galaxies move apart, simply because they did so in the past, as a result of the big bang and/or the inflationary era. There is no Newtonian answer to an accelerating universe, though. Most cosmologists today view recession of galaxies as expansion of space itself. But no physical explanation exists for why this accelerates, other than by dark energy as a "repulsive force".

*Jan van Beverwijckstr. 104, 5017 JA Tilburg, Netherlands, email: herman_telkamp@hotmail.com

Along the line of Einstein, we explore the possibility of a material origin of the positive cosmological constant. This may seem counter intuitive, as matter attracts other matter and so seems to oppose expansion. Yet, matter can cause metric expansion. That is, if the total gravitating mass increases. This is conceivable if one considers e.g. the Schwarzschild space outside of an increasing central mass $M(t)$. The proper displacement dr corresponding to a fixed coordinate displacement dR at coordinate distance R from M will evolve according to $dr(t) = dR/\left(1 - 2GM(t)/c^2R\right)^{-1/2}$, so dr will increase along with M. And actually, something similar is taking place in the universe as the total mass inside of the expanding particle horizon continually increases [3, 4].[1] Thus expansion of the particle horizon provides a premise for metric expansion by gravity.

To consider this further, we assume the spacetime metric of the universe is ruled by the cosmic gravitational potential. But, how to actually determine the cosmic potential is a relatively seldom addressed and largely unanswered question. There exists a simple indication however. Consider the Schwarzschild metric with the sun as central mass. Note that the Schwarzschild coefficient $\alpha_s = 1-2GM_{sun}/c^2R$ is virtually unity anywhere outside of the sun (as $2GM_{sun}/c^2R < 4.3 \cdot 10^{-6},\ R \geq R_{sun}$). In other words, the sun's potential $\varphi_{sun} = -GM_{sun}/R$ is negligible, even at its surface, relative to this huge other potential $\varphi_o = -\frac{1}{2}c^2$, which we can associate with little else but the background potential of the universe. We will address this further below.

Ernst Mach pointed out that, while the influence of a remote star on the total potential here drops off as $1/r$, the number of stars at distance r is proportional to r^2. In this view, which ignores redshift, the farthest stars make (together) the biggest contribution to the total potential here. This concerns precisely the masses that just appear within the moving cosmic horizon and add to the total gravitating mass. Then, will these extra masses also add to the potential? Not necessarily, since any increase of the potential will increase metric distances (i.e. cause apparent recession of all cosmic masses), which in turn reduces the value of the potential. So the effect of mass increase on potential is suppressed by metric expansion of space. Then which equations exactly govern this mechanism? We approach this subject from two directions; a "Newtonian" and a "Machian" approach, as follows. We will throughout assume a flat universe. Angular coordinates are omitted, as we are only concerned with radial motion of cosmic expansion. Subscript o denotes present time (with the exception of φ_o, which is a constant).

Newtonian cosmic potential - We assume gravity propagates at the constant speed of light c. Then, in a big bang scenario, from some initial cosmic time $t = 0$ onward, the total Newtonian potential φ_N is generated by the increasing total mass within the steadily expanding particle horizon. Hence, we assume the gravitational horizon coincides with the particle horizon[2]. Along with the Newtonian potential, scale factor a

[1] Total mass within the particle horizon increases, since the comoving distance to this horizon always increases, up to a possible asymptotic convergence. See e.g. [3, 4].

[2] This is arguable, but may be left undecided, since the precise distance to the gravitational horizon is not relevant here.

and proper distance dr increase, as $dr = ad\chi$, where χ is the comoving coordinate. To circumvent the mutual dependency of cosmic potential and spatial metric, we consider the cosmic potential in a frame of which the spatial coordinates are independent of the scale factor. The comoving coordinate χ fits this purpose, since masses (at large) are at rest in this coordinate, so their comoving position is independent of the changing cosmic potential. The particle horizon χ_{ph} propagates as

$$\chi_{ph} = c\eta, \tag{1}$$

where η is conformal time. As usual, the scale factor is normalized at $a_o = 1$ at present time. This is convenient, since the constant mass density in comoving coordinates ρ_χ (the "comoving" density) then equals ρ_o, the present mass density (ordinary + dark matter) in proper units,

$$\rho_\chi = \rho_o. \tag{2}$$

The increment of the total mass M enclosed by the moving horizon is

$$dM = 4\pi\chi^2\rho_\chi d\chi. \tag{3}$$

Then, the Newtonian cosmic potential in the (η, χ) frame follows from the integral

$$\varphi_N(\eta) = -\int_o^{\chi_{ph}=c\eta} \frac{G}{\chi}\frac{dM}{d\chi}d\chi = -\int_o^{\chi_{ph}=c\eta} \frac{G4\pi\chi^2\rho_\chi}{\chi}d\chi = -2\pi G\rho_\chi c^2\eta^2 = -2\pi G\rho_o c^2\eta^2. \tag{4}$$

Machian cosmic potential - In a well known paper of 1953 [1], Sciama derived, on theoretical grounds and several assumptions, a cosmic potential $\sim -c^2$. Yet, in a relatively unknown paper of 1925 [2], Schrödinger presented a Machian calculation of the anomalous perihelion precession of planetary orbits, yielding exactly Einstein's famous GR-based result for Mercury. Assume m is the mass of the planet, orbiting the sun at a separation r. The essence of this calculation is that the planet is assigned a small additional inertia μ in the direction of the sun, proportional to the potential of the sun $\varphi_{sun}(r)$ at the position of the planet, while the (fixed) Newtonian inertia m of the planet is considered to be proportional to the (fixed) background potential φ_o of the universe, which is represented by the hollow sphere model. The (very small) Machian inertia $\mu(r) = m\varphi_{sun}(r)/\varphi_o$ reproduces the GR expression of the anomalous precession exactly, provided

$$\varphi_o = -\tfrac{1}{2}c^2. \tag{5}$$

This is no surprise, since φ_o equals the potential appearing in the Schwarzschild metric, as noted above. Yet, the Machian model unambiguously identifies φ_o as the cosmic background potential. Contrary to Sciama's model, Schrödinger's calculation regards perfectly observable local mechanics of the solar system. The result matches actual measurements of the perihelion precession of Mercury and other planets. Therefore, (5) is indirectly confirmed by observation.

Thus, the cosmic potential appears as a constant in our local frame. From this we infer that metric expansion of the universe turns the growing Newtonian potential $\varphi_{_N}(\eta)$ into a constant background potential $\varphi'_{_N}(\eta) = \varphi_o$ in our proper frame. The obvious analogy is the speed of light in the gravitational field. It is well known that, to a remote observer, light appears to slow down while traveling through a region of stronger potential (i.e. Shapiro delay). However, the observer near the gravitating object will always measure exactly c, locally. This means that the proper coordinates are being adjusted by the local potential in such a way that local measurement of the speed of light always yields c. Likewise, the local observer will always experience a fixed background potential φ_o.

The background potential φ_o also offers a natural interpretation of the coefficient α_s in the Schwarzschild metric,

$$ds^2 = \alpha_s c^2 dT^2 - \frac{dR^2}{\alpha_s} - R^2 d\Omega^2. \tag{6}$$

Using $\varphi_o = -\frac{1}{2}c^2$ and $\varphi_{_M}(R) = -GM/R$, and assuming $\left|\varphi_{_M}(R)\right| \ll \left|\varphi_o\right|$ the coefficient α_s can be expressed as

$$\alpha_s = 1 - \frac{2GM}{c^2 R} = \frac{\varphi_o - \varphi_{_M}(R)}{\varphi_o} \simeq \frac{\varphi_o}{\varphi_o + \varphi_{_M}(R)} = \frac{\varphi(\infty)}{\varphi(R)}, \tag{7}$$

i.e. as the ratio of the total potential $\varphi(\infty) = \varphi_o$ at infinity and the total potential $\varphi(R) = \varphi_o + \varphi_{_M}(R)$ at R. This makes perfectly sense from a Machian point of view. A non-zero value of the potential at infinity may raise some eyebrows though, as the Schwarzschild space is asymptotically Minkowski space, which is supposed to be empty. Yet, considering (7), the apparent background potential in the Schwarzschild space suggests that Minkowski space is actually representing our flat cosmological background. That is, a universe homogeneously filled with matter, producing a flat potential $\varphi_o = -\frac{1}{2}c^2$. This potential is represented in the metric coefficients of the various GR metrics (or hidden as $\alpha_s = 1$ in the Minkowski metric, being the limit of the Schwarzschild metric, i.e. $\lim_{M\to 0}(\varphi_o - \varphi_{_M}(R))/\varphi_o = 1$. The constant background potential φ_o provides a material backplane to both "empty" Minkowski space and the Schwarzschild "vacuum". Note that there is nothing in GR that contradicts or excludes this interpretation. A homogeneous, isotropic matter distribution does nothing but creating a flat background, like Minkowski space. It is not a coincidence that the FRW metric of our universe is conformally flat, i.e. Minkowskian for any particular value of the scale factor. Actually, a non-empty Minkowski space solves a few long lasting problems: a flat material background reconciles GR with the Machian principle, as Schrödinger showed in his calculation of the anomalous precession. Moreover, it releases Minkowski space from the unfavorable connotation of being an absolute space. With the cosmic background in place, any motion in Minkowski space becomes relative, as is most desirable from a relativistic perspective. This has some notable consequences. Of particular interest here: if Minkowski space is non-empty, then this suggests that

the de Sitter universe may not be empty too. We will substantiate this by showing that, without invoking exotic dark energy, a de Sitter space emerges naturally from a universe that contains nothing but matter ("dust"). The metric evolution is hidden in the "redshift" of the growing Newtonian potential to the constant Machian potential.

The Newtonian potential subject to metric expansion - In light of the above, we require this "redshifted" value $\varphi'_{N} \equiv \varphi_{N}/f(a)$ to come out equal to the Machian potential, i.e. $\varphi'_{N} = -\frac{1}{2}c^2$, or

$$\varphi'_{N}(\eta) = \frac{\varphi_{N}(\eta)}{f(a)} = -2\pi G\rho_{\chi}c^2\frac{\eta^2}{f(a)} = -\tfrac{1}{2}c^2. \tag{8}$$

Normalizing $f(a_o) = 1$ gives

$$\eta_o^2 = \frac{1}{4\pi G\rho_{\chi}}, \tag{9}$$

and

$$f(a) = \frac{\eta^2}{\eta_o^2}. \tag{10}$$

Like for light, one expects the redshift factor to be a simple function $f(a)$ of the scale factor, which is an immediate measure of the state of metric expansion. Consider the Friedmann equation of the ΛCDM model

$$\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} = H^2 = H_o^2(\frac{\Omega_{mo}}{a^3} + \Omega_{\Lambda o}), \tag{11}$$

where Ω_{mo}, $\Omega_{\Lambda o}$ and H_o are present values of matter density, dark energy density and the Hubble parameter, respectively. For simplicity, we ignore other density terms. The model (11) describes a universe filled with a mixture of two perfect fluids: dust and dark energy (in the form of the cosmological constant), with equation of state parameters $w = 0$ and $w = -1$, respectively. For a flat universe, the deceleration parameter q relates to w according to

$$q = \tfrac{1}{2}(1 + 3w). \tag{12}$$

At early times, matter dominates and $w = 0$, $q = 1/2$. At late times Λ dominates and $w = -1$, $q = -1$. So $q(t)$ runs from $1/2$ to -1. The solution of the Friedmann equation for a perfect fluid with equation of state parameter w [6] is, when expressed in terms of the deceleration parameter q,

$$a(t) = \begin{cases} \left(\dfrac{t}{t_o}\right)^{1/(1+q)} & q \neq -1, \qquad t_o = \dfrac{1}{(1+q)H_o} = \dfrac{\eta_o}{1+q}, \\ \\ e^{H_{\Lambda}t} & q = -1, \qquad H_{\Lambda}^2 = \Lambda c^2/3 = 1/\eta_o^2. \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

This solution allows us to express conformal time as a function of scale factor, thus to solve for redshift factor $f(a)$, according to

$$f(a) = \frac{\eta^2}{\eta_o^2} = \left(\frac{1}{\eta_o}\int_{t_o}^{t} a^{-1}dt + 1\right)^2 = \begin{cases} a^{2q} & q \neq -1 \\ (2 - a^{-1})^2 & q = -1. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

So this is the factor which turns the evolving Newtonian potential in a constant background potential φ_o. Differentiating the square root of (14) gives, for any q,

$$d\eta = \pm\eta_o q a^{q-1} da. \tag{15}$$

Substituting $d\eta \equiv dt/a$ in (15) yields the differential equation for the scale factor

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \pm\frac{a^{-q}}{q\eta_o}, \tag{16}$$

which has (13) as solutions, as expected.

Hence, in case of a *matter-only* universe, the constancy of the background potential, subject to expansion of the horizon, gives rise to eq. (16), which reproduces the standard solutions (13) of the Friedmann equation for a perfect fluid of arbitrary equation of state w, including the solution of a de Sitter universe for $w = -1$ (i.e. $q = -1$). The present value $\Omega_{\Lambda 0}$ of the density parameter of a material Λ follows from (9),(2) and (13),

$$\Omega_{\Lambda 0} = \frac{H_\Lambda^2}{H_o^2} = \frac{4\pi G\rho_\chi}{H_o^2} = \frac{4\pi G\rho_o}{H_o^2}, \tag{17}$$

which unambiguously shows its connection with matter. This leads us to conclude that the cosmological constant may indeed have a material origin, as conjectured by Einstein. Furthermore, since the density parameter of dust has a present value

$$\Omega_{mo} = \frac{\rho_o}{\rho_{co}} = \frac{8\pi G\rho_o}{3H_o^2}, \tag{18}$$

it follows that the two density parameters have a fixed ratio,[3]

$$\Omega_{\Lambda o} = \tfrac{3}{2}\Omega_{mo}. \tag{19}$$

For $\Omega_r = \Omega_k = 0$ (no radiation, flat universe) this gives exactly $\Omega_{mo} = 0.4$ and $\Omega_{\Lambda o} = 0.6$. Interestingly close to observation, though not quite good enough, given the current status of observed values ($\widetilde{\Omega}_{mo} \simeq 0.3$, $\widetilde{\Omega}_{\Lambda o} \simeq 0.7$). So this presents an issue, with no obvious resolution.

One however may speculatively consider that a material origin of Λ could impact the structure of the ΛCDM model (11). The density parameters in the standard Friedmann equation are assumed to represent distinct forms of energy and to be independent, which is not the case with the proposed connection of Λ to matter. Dependency gives rise to cross-terms, hence, to a modification of the standard model by an additional cross term, that could possibly make up for the (small) mismatch of the density parameters.

The de Sitter universe is an asymptotic solution of the Friedmann equations with positive cosmological constant. Asymptotically $a(t)$ approaches infinity and matter density obviously goes to zero. So, is the de Sitter space eventually empty nevertheless? It may appear so, but if the cosmological constant is indeed connected to the cosmic potential, then it needs matter to exist at all.

[3]This fixed ratio holds for any value of present time t_o. For a particular t_o, comoving density ρ_χ is constant over time. But it scales like ρ_o with change of present time t_o, since $\rho_\chi = \rho_o$ for normalized scale factor $a(t_o) = a_o = 1$.

References

[1] D.W. Sciama, M.N.R.A.S., 113 , 34 (1953).

[2] E. Schrödinger, Ann. der Phys., 77, 325-336 (1925). For an English translation see: J. Barbour, H. Pfister (eds.), *Mach's Principle: From Newton's Bucket to Quantum Gravity* (Einstein Studies Vol. 6), Birkhäuser, Boston (1992)

[3] B. Margalef-Bentabol et al., JCAP 02 (2013) 015. arXiv:astro-ph/1302.2186

[4] T.M. Davis and C.H. Lineweaver, Proc.Astron.Soc.Austral, 21, 97-109 (2004). arXiv:astro-ph/0310808

[5] E. Harrison, *Cosmology*, Cambridge University Press (1981)

[6] Ø. Grøn, S. Hervik, *Einstein's General Theory of Relativity*, Springer (2007)

[7] G. Hinshaw et al. , ApJS, 208, 19 Supp., 2013, arXiv:1212.5226v3

[8] P.A.R. Ade et al. (Planck Collaboration 2013 XVI), arXiv:1303.5076v1